

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Amendments to the Claims

Independent claims 1 and 20 have been amended to further distinguish the invention recited therein from the references identified in the rejections discussed below. Further, claim 11 has been amended to remain consistent with amended independent claim 1.

II. 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection

Claims 1, 4 and 6-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Motamed et al. (U.S. 7,081,969), Stephens et al. (U.S. 2003/0095524), Wanda (U.S. 7,408,671) and Ferlitsch (U.S. 7,304,758). This rejection is believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 1 and 20 and claims 4 and 6-19 that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites an apparatus including an update notification section for, when the acquired update information is related to an application that implements the desired service, notifying each electronic apparatus, which implements the desired service in liaison with the other electronic apparatuses by causing the application related to the acquired update information to operate and is capable of updating the application related to the acquired update information, of the acquired update information related to the application that implements the desired service.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection acknowledges that Motamed, Stephens and Wanda fail to disclose or suggest the features required by the update notification section, as recited in previously presented claim 1. In light of the above, the present rejection relies on Ferlitsch for teaching the above-mentioned features that are admittedly lacking from Motamed, Stephens and Wanda. However, in view of the above-identified amendments to claim 1, which clarify the operation of the update notification section, it is submitted that Ferlitsch fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features now required by the update notification section, as recited in claim 1.

Rather, Ferlitsch merely teaches that a computer device (connected to a printer or printers) (i) determines whether or not a printer driver is updatable, (ii) determines whether or not permission to perform an update exists, such that if permission to perform the update exists, then the computer device downloads an updated version of the printer driver, and (iii) notifies the user that the printer driver has been updated (see Fig. 5, col. 6, lines 1-8 and col. 12, lines 36-67). Further, Ferlitsch teaches that it is possible to update multiple printer devices according to the above mentioned steps, such that only the computer devices that have updated the printer drivers can execute print jobs (see Fig. 5, col. 6, lines 1-8 and col. 12, lines 36-67).

In other words, according to the disclosure of Ferlitsch, the computer device itself (connected to the printer or printers) determines whether or not the printer driver can be updated and determines whether or not to notify the user of the computer device that the printer driver has been updated.

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Ferlitsch teaches that computer device itself (connected to the printer or printers) determines whether or not to notify the user of the computer

device that the printer driver has been updated, but fails to disclose or suggest notifying each electronic apparatus, which implements the desired service in liaison with the other electronic apparatuses by causing the application related to the acquired update information to operate and is capable of updating the application related to the acquired update information, of the acquired update information related to the application that implements the desired service, as required by claim 1.

In other words, Ferlitsch merely teaches that the user of the computer device connected to the printer is notified that the printer driver of the printer has been updated, but fails to disclose or suggest that every electronic apparatus that implements the desired service in liaison with each other is notified of the available updated information related to the application that implements the desired service, as required by claim 1.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that claim 1 and claims 4 and 6-19 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Motamed, Stephens, Wanda and Ferlitsch.

Applicants also note that a result of the structure required by claim 1 is that each electronic apparatus that implements the desired service in liaison with each other is able to synchronize the updated versions of the application that implements the desired service. On the other hand, the combination of Motamed, Stephens, Wanda and/or Ferlitsch does not require a structure that provides the above-mentioned results, because the combination of Motamed, Stephens, Wanda and/or Ferlitsch merely results in individual computer devices notifying respective users of the individual computer devices that a respective printer or printers connected thereto have had a driver update.

For the reasons discussed above, it is also submitted that there is no disclosure or suggestion in Motamed, Stephens, Wanda and/or Ferlitsch or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Motamed, Stephens, Wanda and/or Ferlitsch to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 4 and 6-19 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Independent claim 20 is directed to a method, and recites features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 20 is allowable over Motamed, Stephens, Wanda and/or Ferlitsch.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Takahiro WATANABE et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By: 2009.04.23 13:20:06 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
April 23, 2009